arXiv:1408.6046v1 [math.CO] 26 Aug 2014

Equitable Coloring of Graphs with Intermediate Maximum Degree

Bor-Liang Chen
Department of Business Administration
National Taichung University of Science and Technology
Taichung 404, Taiwan
Email:blchen@ntit.edu.tw

Kuo-Ching Huang*
Department of Financial and Computational Mathematics
Providence University
Shalu 43301, Taichung, Taiwan
Email:kchuang@gm.pu.edu.tw

Ko-Wei Lih †
Institute of Mathematics
Academia Sinica
Taipei 10617, Taiwan
Email:makwlih@sinica.edu.tw

August 27, 2014

Abstract

If the vertices of a graph G are colored with k colors such that no adjacent vertices receive the same color and the sizes of any two color classes differ by at most one, then G is said to be equitably k-colorable. Let $|G|$ denote the number of vertices of G and $\Delta = \Delta(G)$ the maximum degree of a vertex in G. We prove that a graph G of order at least 6 is equitably Δ-colorable if G satisfies $(|G|+1)/3 \leqslant \Delta < |G|/2$ and none of its components is a $K_{\Delta+1}$.

Keywords: *chromatic number; equitable coloring; equitable chromatic number; equitable chromatic threshold*

Mathematical Subject Classification (MSC) 2010: 05C15

*Research supported by MOST (No. 103-2115-M-126-002).
†Research supported by NSC (No. 102-2115-M-001-010).

1 Introduction

A graph G consists of a vertex set $V(G)$ and an edge set $E(G)$. All graphs considered in this paper are finite, loopless, and without multiple edges. Let $|G|$ denote the *order* of G, i.e., the number of vertices of G. A set of vertices of G is called *independent* if its members are mutually non-adjacent. If the vertices of G can be partitioned into k subsets $V_1, V_2, \ldots, V_k$ such that each V_i is an independent set, then G is said to be *k-colorable* and the k sets are called *color classes*. Equivalently, a coloring can be viewed as a function $\pi : V(G) \to \{1, 2, \ldots, k\}$ such that adjacent vertices are mapped to distinct numbers. The mapping π is said to be a (proper) *k-coloring*. All pre-images of a fixed i, $1 \leqslant i \leqslant k$, form a color class. The smallest integer k such that G is k-colorable is called the *chromatic number* of G and is denoted by $\chi(G)$. The graph G is said to be equitably colored with k colors, or *equitably k-colorable*, if there is a k-coloring that satisfies the condition $||V_i| - |V_j|| \leqslant 1$ for every pair of color classes V_i and V_j. The smallest integer k for which G is equitably k-colorable is called the *equitable chromatic number* of G and is denoted by $\chi_=(G)$. Clearly, $\chi(G) \leqslant \chi_=(G)$. Lih [6] provides a comprehensive survey of equitable coloring of graphs.

Let $\deg_G(v)$, or $\deg(v)$ for short, denote the degree of vertex v in G and define $\Delta(G) = \max\{\deg(v) \mid v \in V(G)\}$. We usually abbreviate $\Delta(G)$ to Δ when no ambiguity arises. Let K_n, P_n and C_n denote, respectively, a complete graph, a path and a cycle on n vertices. In 1978, Meyer [8] proposed the following.

Conjecture 1 *If a connected graph G is different from a complete graph K_n and an odd cycle C_{2n+1} for any positive integer n, then $\chi_=(G) \leqslant \Delta$.*

Meyer's conjecture, if true, is a generalization of the following theorem of Brooks [1].

Theorem 1 *If a connected graph G is different from a complete graph K_n and an odd cycle C_{2n+1} for any positive integer n, then $\chi(G) \leqslant \Delta$.*

Let $\chi^*_=(G)$ denote the smallest integer m such that G is equitably k-colorable for all $k \geqslant m$. We call $\chi^*_=(G)$ the *equitable chromatic threshold* of G. The well-known Hajnal and Szemerédi Theorem [3] established the following for not necessarily connected graphs.

Theorem 2 *For a graph G, $\chi^*_=(G) \leqslant \Delta + 1$.*

By definition, $\chi_=(G) \leqslant \chi^*_=(G)$. In fact, $\chi^*_=(G)$ may be greater than $\chi_=(G)$. For instance, the complete bipartite graph $K_{3,3}$ is equitably 2-colorable, but not equitably 3-colorable. In 1994, Chen, Lih and Wu [2] proposed the following conjecture.

Conjecture 2 *Let G be a connected graph. If G is different from the complete graph K_n, the odd cycle C_{2n+1}, and the complete bipartite graph $K_{2n+1,2n+1}$ for any positive integer n, then G is equitably Δ-colorable.*

The conclusion of the above conjecture can be stated in an equivalent form $\chi^*_=(G) \leqslant \Delta$. It is also immediate to see that the Conjecture 2 implies Conjecture 1. Chen, Lih and Wu [2] confirmed Conjecture 2 for the following special case.

Theorem 3 *Let G be a connected graph with $\Delta \geqslant |G|/2$. If G is different from K_n and $K_{2n+1,2n+1}$ for any positive integer n, then G is equitably Δ-colorable.*

In the present paper, we are going to establish the following.

Theorem 4 *If a graph G of order at least 6 satisfies $(|G|+1)/3 \leqslant \Delta < |G|/2$ and none of its components is a $K_{\Delta+1}$, then G is equitably Δ-colorable.*

This implies that Conjecture 2 holds for a connected graph G satisfying $(|G|+1)/3 \leqslant \Delta < |G|/2$. We note that Conjecture 2 has also been established for any connected graph G satisfying $\Delta \leqslant 3$ in [2]. Kierstead and Kostochka [4] extended it to the case $\Delta = 4$. Conjectures 1 and 2 have been studied intensively with respect to graph classes such as forests, split graphs, outerplanar graphs, series-parallel graphs, planar graphs, graphs with low degeneracies, graphs with bounded treewidth, Kneser graphs, interval graphs, etc. The reader is referred to [6] for more information.

2 Main results

For subsets X and Y of vertices of a graph G, let $\|X, Y\|$ denote the number of edges with one endpoint in X and the other endpoint in Y. Clearly, $\|X, Y\| = \|Y, X\|$. We often abbreviate the singleton $\{x\}$ to x when the context is clear. We write $u \sim v$ to denote that vertices u and v are adjacent. For a vertex $v \in V(G)$, we define the (*open*) *neighborhood* $N(v)$ to be the set $\{u \in V(G) \mid u \sim v\}$. The set $N[v] = N(v) \cup \{v\}$ is called the *closed neighborhood* of v. An m-independent set is an independent set of m vertices. The *independence number* $\alpha(G)$ of G is the maximum integer m such that G has an m-independent set. An *m-matching* is a set of m mutually non-incident edges. A *component* of a graph G is a maximal connected subgraph of G. The subgraph induced by a subset $S \subseteq V(G)$ is denoted by $G[S]$. The disjoint union of m copies of a graph G is denoted by mG.

We call a coloring of G an $[r,s,t]$-*coloring* if it is an $(r+s+t)$-coloring of G having r color classes of size three, s color classes of size two and t singleton color classes. The set of all possible $[r,s,t]$-colorings of G is nonempty since there exists the trivial $[0,0,|G|]$-coloring.

Lemma 5 *Let G be a graph with $\Delta < |G|/2$. Suppose that an $[r,s,t]$-coloring of G satisfies $r+s+t \leqslant \Delta$. Then, for any integer m, $r+s+t \leqslant m \leqslant \Delta$, there exists an $[a,b,c]$-coloring of G satisfying $a+b+c=m$.*

Proof. Let an $[r,s,t]$-coloring of G satisfying $r+s+t \leqslant \Delta$ have color classes $X_i = \{x_i, y_i, z_i\}$, $U_j = \{u_j, v_j\}$ and $\{w_k\}$, where $1 \leqslant i \leqslant r$, $1 \leqslant j \leqslant s$ and $1 \leqslant k \leqslant t$. Let $q = m-(r+s+t)$. Then $q \leqslant \Delta-(r+s+t) < r$ since $2\Delta < |G| = 3r+2s+t \leqslant 4r+2s+2t$. We partition X_i into $\{x_i, y_i\}$ and $\{z_i\}$ for $1 \leqslant i \leqslant q$ to obtain an $[r-q, s+q, t+q]$-coloring of G satisfying $(r-q)+(s+q)+(t+q) = m$. ∎

Lemma 6 *Let G be a graph with $\Delta < |G|/2$. Suppose that an $[r,s,t]$-coloring of G satisfies $r+s+t \leqslant \Delta$. Then G is equitably $(r+s+t)$-colorable.*

Proof. Let an $[r,s,t]$-coloring of G satisfying $r+s+t \leqslant \Delta$ have color classes $X_i = \{x_i, y_i, z_i\}$, $U_j = \{u_j, v_j\}$ and $\{w_k\}$, where $1 \leqslant i \leqslant r$, $1 \leqslant j \leqslant s$ and $1 \leqslant k \leqslant t$. We have $r > t$ since $r - t = (3r+2s+t) - 2(r+s+t) \geqslant |G| - 2\Delta > 0$. If $t = 0$, we are done. Otherwise, we initiate a reduction process to construct an $[r-1, s+2, t-1]$-coloring of G. This process can be repeated until we obtain an $[r-t, s+2t, 0]$-coloring of G that is also an equitable $(r+s+t)$-coloring of G.

The reduction process is described as follows. If $w_k \not\sim w_{k'}$ for some k and k', then $X_1 \cup \{w_k, w_{k'}\}$ can be partitioned into independent sets $\{x_1, y_1\}$, $\{z_1\}$ and $\{w_k, w_{k'}\}$. Hence, G has an $[r-1, s+2, t-1]$-coloring. Suppose $w_k \sim w_{k'}$ for any distinct k and k'. If $z_i \not\sim w_k$ for some i and k, then $X_i \cup w_k$ can be partitioned into independent sets $\{x_i, y_i\}$ and $\{z_i, w_k\}$. Hence, G has an $[r-1, s+2, t-1]$-coloring. Now suppose $\|X_i, w_k\| = 3$ for all i and k. If $\|\{x_1, w_1\}, U_j\| \geqslant 2$ for all j, then $2\Delta \geqslant \deg(x_1)+\deg(w_1) \geqslant \sum_{k=1}^{t} \|x_1, w_k\| + \sum_{i=1}^{r} \|w_1, X_i\| + \sum_{k=1}^{t} \|w_1, w_k\| + \sum_{j=1}^{s} \|\{x_1, w_1\}, U_j\| \geqslant t + 3r + t - 1 + 2s \geqslant |G| > 2\Delta$, a contradiction. Hence, $\|\{x_1, w_1\}, U_j\| \leqslant 1$ for some j. Since $G[\{x_1, w_1\} \cup U_j]$ is equal to $P_3 \cup K_1$ or $K_2 \cup 2K_1$, there exist two disjoint 2-independent sets A and B in $G[\{x_1, w_1\} \cup U_j]$. Thus $w_1 \cup X_1 \cup U_j$ can be partitioned into disjoint 2-independent sets A, B and $\{y_1, z_1\}$. Hence, G has an $[r-1, s+2, t-1]$-coloring. ∎

A coloring of G is called *maximal* if it is an $[r,s,t]$-coloring of G for some r,s and t such that for any other $[r',s',t']$-coloring, we have (i) $r > r'$, or (ii) $s \geqslant s'$ when $r = r'$. The existence of a maximal $[r,s,t]$-coloring of G implies that G cannot have more than r mutually disjoint 3-independent sets.

Theorem 7 *If a graph G of order at least 6 satisfies $(|G|+1)/3 \leqslant \Delta < |G|/2$ and none of its components is a $K_{\Delta+1}$, then any maximal $[r,s,t]$-coloring of G satisfies $r+s+t \leqslant \Delta$.*

The proof of the above theorem will be deferred to the final section.

Proof of Theorem 4. Choose any maximal $[r,s,t]$-coloring of G. It follows from Theorem 7 that $r+s+t \leqslant \Delta$. By Lemma 5, there exists an $[a,b,c]$-coloring of G satisfying $a+b+c=\Delta$. By Lemma 6, G is equitably Δ-colorable. ∎

An examination of the proof of Theorem 7 shows that the following can also be derived.

Theorem 8 *Ift a graph G of order at least 6 satisfies $(|G|+1)/3 \leqslant \Delta < |G|/2$ and none of its components is a $K_{\Delta+1}$, then*

$$\chi^*_=(G) \leqslant \min\{r+s+t \mid \textit{There exists an } [r,s,t]\textit{-coloring of } G\}.$$

3 Proof of Theorem 7

Lemma 9 *Let the color classes of a maximal $[r,s,t]$-coloring of G be denoted by $X_i = \{x_i, y_i, z_i\}$, $U_j = \{u_j, v_j\}$ and $\{w_k\}$, where $1 \leqslant i \leqslant r$, $1 \leqslant j \leqslant s$ and $1 \leqslant k \leqslant t$. Then the following statements hold.*

1. *The vertices $w_1, w_2, \ldots, w_t$ are mutually adjacent.*
2. *For all k and j, $\|w_k, U_j\| \geqslant 1$.*
3. *If $\|w_k, U_j\| = 1$ with $w_k \sim u_j$ for some j and k, then $w_{k'} \sim u_j$ for all k'.*
4. *If $\|w_k, X_i\| = 1$ with $w_k \sim x_i$ for some i and k, then $w_{k'} \sim x_i$ for all k'.*
5. *For all i, k and k' $(k \neq k')$, $\|\{w_k, w_{k'}\}, X_i\| \geqslant 2$. If $\|\{w_k, w_{k'}\}, X_i\| = 2$, then $\|w_k, X_i\| = \|w_{k'}, X_i\| = 1$.*
6. *If $\|w_k, X_i\| = 0$, then $\|X_i, U_j\| \geqslant 3$ and $\|w_k \cup X_i, U_j\| \geqslant 4$, for all j. Moreover, $\|w_k \cup X_i, \beta\| \geqslant 3$ for some β in U_j.*

7. *For all distinct j and j', there exists a 2-matching in $G[U_j \cup U_{j'}]$.*

8. *If $\|U_j, U_{j'}\| = 2$ for all distinct j and j', then $G[\cup_{h=1}^{s} U_h] = 2K_s$.*

9. *If $\|X_i, U_j\| = 0$, then (i) $\|w_k, X_i\| \geqslant 2$ and $\|w_k, X_i \cup U_j\| \geqslant 4$ for all k; (ii) $\|\gamma, X_i\| \geqslant 2$ (implying $\|X_i, U_{j'}\| \geqslant 4$) and $\|\gamma, X_i \cup U_j\| \geqslant 4$ for all $j' \neq j$ and all $\gamma \in U_{j'}$.*

10. *If $\|X_i, U_j\| = 1$, then $\|X_i, U_{j'}\| \geqslant 3$ for all $j' \neq j$.*

11. *For all i, j and j' ($j \neq j'$), $\|X_i, U_j \cup U_{j'}\| \geqslant 4$.*

12. *If $\|X_i, U_j\| = \|X_i, U_{j'}\| = \|U_j, U_{j'}\| = 2$, then $G[X_i \cup U_j \cup U_{j'}] = K_1 \cup 2K_3$.*

13. *If $\|w_k, U_j\| = \|w_k, U_{j'}\| = 1$ and $\|U_j, U_{j'}\| = 2$, then $G[w_k \cup U_j \cup U_{j'}] = K_2 \cup K_3$.*

Proof. 1. Suppose that there were two non-adjacent w_k and $w_{k'}$. Since $\{w_k, w_{k'}\}$ is an independent set disjoint from all U_j's, there would be an $[r, s+1, t-2]$-coloring of G, a contradiction.

2. Suppose that $\|w_k, U_j\| = 0$ for some k and j. Since $w_k \cup U_j$ is a 3-independent set disjoint from all X_i's, G would have more than r 3-independent sets, a contradiction.

3. Suppose that $w_{k'}$ were not adjacent to u_j. Since $\{w_k, w_{k'}\} \cup U_j$ can be partitioned into independent sets $\{w_k, v_j\}$ and $\{w_{k'}, u_j\}$, there would be an $[r, s+1, t-2]$-coloring of G, a contradiction.

4. Suppose that $w_{k'}$ were not adjacent to x_i. Since $\{w_k, w_{k'}\} \cup X_i$ can be partitioned into independent sets $\{w_k, y_i, z_i\}$ and $\{w_{k'}, x_i\}$, there would be an $[r, s+1, t-2]$-coloring of G, a contradiction.

5. Suppose that $\|\{w_k, w_{k'}\}, X_i\| \leqslant 1$ for some i, k and k' ($k \neq k'$). Since $G[\{w_k, w_{k'}\} \cup X_i]$ is either $P_2 \cup 3K_1$ or $P_3 \cup 2K_1$, each of which can be partitioned into a 3-independent set and a 2-independent set, there would be an $[r, s+1, t-2]$-coloring of G, a contradiction. Therefore, $\|\{w_k, w_{k'}\}, X_i\| \geqslant 2$ for all i, k and k' ($k \neq k'$).

Now, suppose that $\|\{w_k, w_{k'}\}, X_i\| = 2$ for some i, k and k' ($k \neq k'$). We may also suppose that $\|w_k, X_i\| \leqslant \|w_{k'}, X_i\| \leqslant 2$. If $\|w_k, X_i\| \geqslant 1$, then $\|w_k, X_i\| = \|w_{k'}, X_i\| = 1$ and we are done. Otherwise, $\|w_{k'}, X_i\| = 2$. There would be some vertex $\alpha \in X_i$ such that $\{w_{k'}, \alpha\}$ is an independent set. Since $\{w_k, w_{k'}\} \cup X_i$ can be partitioned into independent sets $w_k \cup (X_i \setminus \{\alpha\})$ and $\{w_{k'}, \alpha\}$, there would be an $[r, s+1, t-2]$-coloring of G, a contradiction.

6. Let $\|w_k, X_i\| = 0$ and $\alpha \in X_i$. Suppose that $\|\alpha, U_j\| = 0$ for some U_j. Since $w_k \cup X_i \cup U_j$ can be partitioned into independent sets $w_k \cup (X_i \setminus \{\alpha\})$ and $\{\alpha\} \cup U_j$, G would have more than r 3-independent sets, a contradiction. Therefore, $\|\alpha, U_j\| \geqslant 1$ for any $\alpha \in X_i$ and any U_j, and hence $\|X_i, U_j\| \geqslant 3$. Since $\|w_k, U_j\| \geqslant 1$ by (2), $\|w_k \cup X_i, U_j\| = \|w_k, U_j\| + \|X_i, U_j\| \geqslant 4$.

Suppose that, for some U_j, $\|w_k \cup X_i, u_j\| \leqslant \|w_k \cup X_i, v_j\| \leqslant 2$. Since $4 \leqslant \|w_k \cup X_i, U_j\| = \|w_k \cup X_i, u_j\| + \|w_k \cup X_i, v_j\| \leqslant 4$, we have $\|w_k, U_j\| = \|\alpha, U_j\| = 1$ for all $\alpha \in X_i$ by (2) and the preceding paragraph, and hence $\|w_k \cup X_i, u_j\| = \|w_k \cup X_i, v_j\| = 2$. We may suppose that $u_j \sim w_k$, $u_j \sim x_i$, $v_j \sim y_i$ and $v_j \sim z_i$. Since $w_k \cup X_i \cup U_j$ can be partitioned into independent sets $\{u_j, y_i, z_i\}$ and $\{v_j, w_k, x_i\}$, G would have more than r 3-independent sets, a contradiction.

7. Suppose that $\|u_j, U_{j'}\| = 0$ in $G[U_j \cup U_{j'}]$. Since $u_j \cup U_{j'}$ is a 3-independent set disjoint from all X_i's, G would have more than r 3-independent sets, a contradiction. Hence, $\|u_j, U_{j'}\| \geqslant 1$. Similarly, $\|v_j, U_{j'}\| \geqslant 1$, $\|u_{j'}, U_j\| \geqslant 1$ and $\|v_{j'}, U_j\| \geqslant 1$. Suppose that $u_j \sim u_{j'}$. If $v_j \sim v_{j'}$, then $\{u_j u_{j'}, v_j v_{j'}\}$ is a desired matching. Otherwise, $v_j \sim u_{j'}$. Since $\|v_{j'}, U_j\| \geqslant 1$, $v_{j'} \sim u_j$ and then $\{u_j v_{j'}, v_j u_{j'}\}$ is a desired matching.

8. For $j \neq j'$, there is a 2-matching in $G[U_j \cup U_{j'}]$ by (7). Then the assumption $\|U_j, U_{j'}\| = 2$ implies that $\|u_j, U_{j'}\| = \|v_j, U_{j'}\| = 1$ and $G[U_j \cup U_{j'}] = \{u_j u_{j'}, v_j v_{j'}\}$ or $\{u_j v_{j'}, v_j u_{j'}\}$. By renaming the vertices if necessary, we may suppose that $N[u_1] = \{u_1, \ldots, u_s\}$ and $N[v_1] = \{v_1, \ldots, v_s\}$ in $G[\cup_{t=1}^{s} U_t]$. For any distinct $j, j' > 1$, if $G[U_j \cup U_{j'}] = \{u_j v_{j'}, v_j u_{j'}\}$, then $G[U_1 \cup U_j \cup U_{j'}]$ is a C_6 which contains two disjoint 3-independent sets. Thus G would have more than r 3-independent sets, a contradiction. Hence, $G[U_j \cup U_{j'}] = \{u_j u_{j'}, v_j v_{j'}\}$, and then $N[u_j] = N[u_1]$ and $N[v_j] = N[v_1]$ in $G[\cup_{h=1}^{s} U_h]$. Therefore, $G[\cup_{h=1}^{s} U_h] = 2K_s$.

9. Assume $\|X_i, U_j\| = 0$. If $\|w_k, X_i\| \leqslant 1$ for some k, then $w_k \cup (X_i \setminus \{\alpha\})$ is a 3-independent set for some $\alpha \in X_i$. Since $w_k \cup X_i \cup U_j$ can be partitioned into independent sets $w_k \cup (X_i \setminus \{\alpha\})$ and $\{\alpha\} \cup U_j$, G would have more than r 3-independent sets, a contradiction. Hence, $\|w_k, X_i\| \geqslant 2$ for all k. Similarly, $\|\gamma, X_i\| \geqslant 2$ for any $j' \neq j$ and any $\gamma \in U_{j'}$, and then $\|X_i, U_{j'}\| = \|u_{j'}, X_i\| + \|v_{j'}, X_i\| \geqslant 2 + 2 = 4$.

Suppose that $\|w_k, X_i \cup U_j\| \leqslant 3$ for some k. Since $X_i \cup U_j$ contains exactly five vertices, there are two vertices α and β in $X_i \cup U_j$ such that $\{w_k, \alpha, \beta\}$ is an independent set. Since $w_k \cup X_i \cup U_j$ can be partitioned into independent sets $\{w_k, \alpha, \beta\}$ and $(X_i \cup U_j) \setminus \{\alpha, \beta\}$, G would have more than r 3-independent sets, a contradiction. Therefore, $\|w_k, X_i \cup U_j\| \geqslant 4$ for all k. Similarly, $\|\gamma, X_i \cup U_j\| \geqslant 4$ for any $j' \neq j$ and any $\gamma \in U_{j'}$.

10. We may assume that the unique edge between X_i and U_j is x_iu_j. If $\|X_i, U_{j'}\| \leqslant 2$ for some $j' \neq j$, then there is some vertex $\alpha \in X_i$ such that $U_{j'} \cup \{\alpha\}$ is a 3-independent set. Since $X_i \cup U_j \cup U_{j'}$ can be partitioned into independent sets $\{u_j\}$, $\{v_j\} \cup (X_i \setminus \{\alpha\})$ and $U_{j'} \cup \{\alpha\}$, G would have more than r 3-independent sets, a contradiction. Therefore, $\|X_i, U_{j'}\| \geqslant 3$ for all $j' \neq j$.

11. We may suppose that $\|X_i, U_j\| \leqslant \|X_i, U_{j'}\|$. If $\|X_i, U_j\| = 0$, then $\|X_i, U_j \cup U_{j'}\| = \|X_i, U_{j'}\| \geqslant 4$ by (9). If $\|X_i, U_j\| = 1$, then $\|X_i, U_j \cup U_{j'}\| = \|X_i, U_j\| + \|X_i, U_{j'}\| \geqslant 1+3 = 4$ by (10). If $\|X_i, U_j\| \geqslant 2$, then $\|X_i, U_j \cup U_{j'}\| = \|X_i, U_j\| + \|X_i, U_{j'}\| \geqslant 2+2 = 4$. Therefore, $\|X_i, U_j \cup U_{j'}\| \geqslant 4$.

12. We may assume that $\|X_i, U_j\| = \|X_i, U_{j'}\| = \|U_j, U_{j'}\| = 2$ with $x_i \sim u_j$, $u_j \sim u_{j'}$ and $v_j \sim v_{j'}$. If $u_j \sim y_i$ or $u_j \sim z_i$, then $\|v_j, X_i\| = 0$. Since $\|X_i, U_{j'}\| = 2$, there is some vertex $\alpha \in X_i$ such that $U_{j'} \cup \{\alpha\}$ is a 3-independent set. Since $X_i \cup U_j \cup U_{j'}$ can be partitioned into independent sets $\{u_j\}$, $U_{j'} \cup \{\alpha\}$ and $\{v_j\} \cup (X_i \setminus \{\alpha\})$, G would have more than r 3-independent sets, a contradiction. Hence, $\|u_j, X_i\| = 1$.

Now, suppose $v_j \sim x_i$. Since $\|X_i, U_{j'}\| = 2$, there is some vertex $\beta \in X_i$ such that $U_{j'} \cup \{\beta\}$ is a 3-independent set. Let γ denote one of y_i and z_i that is different from β. Since $\|y_i, U_j\| = \|z_i, U_j\| = 0$, $U_j \cup \{\gamma\}$ is a 3-independent set. Since $X_i \cup U_j \cup U_{j'}$ can be partitioned into independent sets $X_i \setminus \{\beta, \gamma\}$, $U_{j'} \cup \{\beta\}$ and $U_j \cup \{\gamma\}$, G would have more than r 3-independent sets, a contradiction.

Next, suppose that $v_j \sim y_i$. (The case that $v_j \sim z_i$ is similar.) If $u_{j'} \not\sim x_i$, since $X_i \cup U_j \cup U_{j'}$ can be partitioned into independent sets $\{v_{j'}\}$, $\{u_{j'}, v_j, x_i\}$ and $\{u_j, y_i, z_i\}$, G would have more than r 3-independent sets, a contradiction. Hence, $u_{j'} \sim x_i$. If $v_{j'} \not\sim y_i$, since $X_i \cup U_j \cup U_{j'}$ can be partitioned into 3-independent sets $\{u_{j'}\}$, $\{u_j, v_{j'}, y_i\}$ and $\{v_j, x_i, z_i\}$, G would have more than r 3-independent sets, a contradiction. Hence, $v_{j'} \sim y_i$. Therefore, $G[X_i \cup U_j \cup U_{j'}]$ consists of the singleton z_i together with two 3-cycles $x_iu_ju_{j'}x_i$ and $y_iv_jv_{j'}y_i$.

13. We may assume that $\|w_k, U_j\| = \|w_k, U_{j'}\| = 1$ and $\|U_j, U_{j'}\| = 2$ with $w_k \sim u_j$, $u_j \sim u_{j'}$ and $v_j \sim v_{j'}$. Suppose that $u_{j'} \not\sim w_k$. Since $\{v_j, u_{j'}, w_k\}$ is an independent set disjoint from all X_i's, G would have more than r 3-independent sets, a contradiction. Hence, $u_{j'} \sim w_k$, and then $G[w_k \cup U_j \cup U_{j'}]$ consists of an edge $v_jv_{j'}$ and a 3-cycle $w_ku_ju_{j'}w_k$. ∎

Proof of Theorem 7. We first note that $\Delta \geqslant 3$ when G has at least 6 vertices and $(|G|+1)/3 \leqslant \Delta$. Then $\alpha(G) \geqslant |G|/\chi(G) \geqslant |G|/\Delta > 2$ by Brooks' Theorem under our assumptions. Hence, any maximal $[r, s, t]$-coloring of G satisfies $r \geqslant 1$.

In the first stage, we show that $r+s+t \leqslant \Delta+1$ for any maximal $[r,s,t]$-coloring of G. Suppose on the contrary that there exists a maximal $[r,s,t]$-coloring of G with $r+s+t \geqslant \Delta+2$ such that the singleton color classes are $\{w_k\}$, $1 \leqslant k \leqslant t$. By Theorem 2, there exists an equitable $(\Delta+1)$-coloring of G having $p \geqslant 0$ color classes of size $c+1$ and $q > 0$ color classes of size c. Hence $|G| = (c+1)p + cq$ and $p+q = \Delta+1$. If $c \geqslant 3$, then $|G| \geqslant 3\Delta+3+p > |G|$, a contradiction. If $c = 2$, then $2\Delta+2+p = |G| = 3r+2s+t \geqslant 2\Delta+4+r-t$. It follow that $t \geqslant r-p+2 \geqslant 2$ by the maximality of the supposed $[r,s,t]$-coloring. If $c = 1$, then $2\Delta+2 \geqslant \Delta+1+p = |G| \geqslant 2\Delta+4+r-t$. It follow that $t \geqslant r+2 > 2$. Thus we always have $t \geqslant 2$. By (1), (2) and (5) of Lemma 9, $2\Delta \geqslant \deg(w_1)+\deg(w_2) = \sum_{i=1}^{r} \|\{w_1,w_2\},X_i\| + \sum_{i=1}^{s}(\|\{w_1,w_2\},U_i\|) + \sum_{i=1}^{t}(\|\{w_1,w_2\},w_i\|) \geqslant 2r+2s+2(t-1) = 2(r+s+t-1) > 2\Delta$, a contradiction.

In the second stage, suppose that there exists a maximal $[r,s,t]$-coloring of G with $r+s+t = \Delta+1$ such that $r \geqslant 1$ and the color classes are $X_i = \{x_i,y_i,z_i\}$, $U_j = \{u_j,v_j\}$ and $\{w_k\}$, where $1 \leqslant i \leqslant r$, $1 \leqslant j \leqslant s$ and $1 \leqslant k \leqslant t$. Then we will derive contradictions for all of the following possible cases for t, and hence conclude that $r+s+t \leqslant \Delta$.

Case 1. There is more than one singleton color class, i.e., $t \geqslant 2$.

Pick an arbitrary pair of distinct k and k'. We have $2\Delta \geqslant \deg(w_k)+\deg(w_{k'}) = \sum_{i=1}^{r}\|\{w_k,w_{k'}\},X_i\| + \sum_{i=1}^{s}\|\{w_k,w_{k'}\},U_i\| + \sum_{i=1}^{t}\|\{w_k,w_{k'}\},w_i\| \geqslant 2r+2s+2(t-1) = 2\Delta$ by (1), (2) and (5) of Lemma 9. It follows that $\deg(w_k) = \deg(w_{k'}) = \Delta$, $\|\{w_k,w_{k'}\},X_i\| = 2$ and $\|w_k,U_j\| = 1$ for all i, j, k and k' $(k \neq k')$. By (1) and (5) of Lemma 9, we may suppose that $N[w_1] = \{x_1,\ldots,x_r,u_1,\ldots,u_s,w_1,\ldots,w_t\}$. By (3) and (4) of Lemma 9, $N[w_k] = N[w_1]$ for any k. If $x_i \not\sim x_{i'}$ for some $i \neq i'$, then G would have an $[r,s+1,t-2]$-coloring since $X_i \cup X_{i'} \cup \{w_1,w_2\}$ can be partitioned into independent sets $\{w_1,y_i,z_i\}$, $\{w_2,y_{i'},z_{i'}\}$ and $\{x_i,x_{i'}\}$. Hence, $x_i \sim x_{i'}$ for all i and i'. Similarly, x_i, u_j and $u_{j'}$ are mutually adjacent for all i, j and j' $(j \neq j')$. Then $\{x_1,\ldots,x_r,u_1,\ldots,u_s,w_1,\ldots,w_t\}$ forms a $K_{\Delta+1}$, a contradiction.

Case 2. There is no singleton color class, i.e., $t = 0$.

Since $|G| = 3r+2s = 3\Delta+3-s$, we have $s = 3\Delta+3-|G| \geqslant 4$.

First suppose $\|X_i,U_j\| \geqslant 2$ for all i and j. Then $2\Delta \geqslant \deg(u_j)+\deg(v_j) = \sum_{i=1}^{r}\|X_i,U_j\| + \sum_{j'=1}^{s}\|U_j,U_{j'}\| \geqslant 2r+2(s-1) = 2\Delta$ by (7) of Lemma 9. Then $\deg(u_j) = \deg(v_j) = \Delta$, $\|X_i,U_j\| = 2$ and $\|U_j,U_{j'}\| = 2$ for all i, j and j' $(j \neq j')$. By (12) of Lemma 9, $\|X_i,u_j\| = \|X_i,v_j\| = 1$ for all i and j. We may suppose that $N[u_1] = \{x_1,\ldots,x_r,u_1,\ldots,u_s\}$. By (8) of Lemma 9, $\{u_1,u_2,\ldots,u_s\}$ forms a K_s. By (12) of Lemma 9, $N[u_j] = N[u_1]$ and $x_i \not\sim v_j$ for all i and j. If $x_i \not\sim x_{i'}$ for some distinct

i and i', then G would have more than r 3-independent sets since $X_1 \cup X_{i'} \cup U_1 \cup U_2$ can be partitioned into independent sets $\{v_i\}$, $\{u_1, y_i, z_i\}$, $\{u_2, y_{i'}, z_{i'}\}$ and $\{v_1, x_i, x_{i'}\}$. Hence, $x_i \sim x_{i'}$ for all distinct i and i'. Then $\{x_1, \ldots, x_r, u_1, \ldots, u_s\}$ forms a $K_{\Delta+1}$, a contradiction.

Next suppose $\|X_i, U_j\| \leqslant 1$ for some i and j, say $\|X_1, U_1\| \leqslant 1$. Let $\mathcal{M} = \{X_i \mid \|X_i, U_j\| \leqslant 1 \text{ for some } j = 1, 2, 3\}$ and $|\mathcal{M}| = m \geqslant 1$. If $X_i \in \mathcal{M}$, then $\|X_i, U_1 \cup U_2 \cup U_3\| = \sum_{j=1}^{3} \|X_i, U_j\| \geqslant \min\{0 + 4 + 4, 1 + 3 + 3\} = 7$ by (9) and (10) of Lemma 9. Therefore $6\Delta \geqslant \sum_{j=1}^{3}(\deg(u_j) + \deg(v_j)) = \sum_{i=1}^{r} \|X_i, U_1 \cup U_2 \cup U_3\| + \sum_{i=1}^{s} \|U_i, U_1 \cup U_2 \cup U_3\| \geqslant 7m + 6(r - m) + 6(s - 1) = 6\Delta + m \geqslant 6\Delta + 1$ by (7) of Lemma 9, a contradiction.

Case 3. There is a unique singleton color class, i.e., $t = 1$.

Since $|G| = 3r + 2s + 1 = 3\Delta + 1 - s$, we have $s = 3\Delta + 1 - |G| \geqslant 2$.

Subcase 3.1. There exists h such that $\|w_1, X_h\| = 0$.

Let $A = \{X_h \mid \|w_1, X_h\| = 0\}$ and $a = |A| \geqslant 1$. Pick an arbitrary pair of distinct i and j. Then $4\Delta \geqslant \deg(u_i) + \deg(v_i) + \deg(u_j) + \deg(v_j) = \sum_{X_h \in A} \|X_h, U_i \cup U_j\| + \sum_{X_h \notin A} \|X_h, U_i \cup U_j\| + \sum_{h=1}^{s} \|U_h, U_i \cup U_j\| + \|w_1, U_i \cup U_j\| \geqslant 6a + 4(r - a) + 4(s - 1) + 2 = 4\Delta + 2(a - 1)$ by (2), (6), (7) and (11) of Lemma 9. Thus $a \leqslant 1$, and hence $a = 1$, say $\|w_1, X_1\| = 0$. Moreover, $\deg(u_j) = \deg(v_j) = \Delta$, $\|U_j, U_{j'}\| = 2$, $\|w_1, U_j\| = 1$ and $\|X_1, U_j\| = 3$. For each j, let

$$B_j^0 = \{X_i \mid \|X_i, U_j\| = 0\} \text{ and } b_j^0 = |B_j^0|;$$

$$B_j^1 = \{X_i \mid \|X_i, U_j\| = 1\} \text{ and } b_j^1 = |B_j^1|.$$

All B_j^0's are mutually disjoint by (9) of Lemma 9. All B_j^1's are mutually disjoint by (10) of Lemma 9. If $X_i \in B_j^0$, then $\|w_1, X_i\| = \|w_1, X_i \cup U_j\| - \|w_1, U_j\| \geqslant 4 - 1 = 3$ by (9) of Lemma 9. Let $\mathcal{B}_0$ denote $\cup_{j=1}^{s} B_j^0$. Then $\Delta \geqslant \deg(w_1) = \sum_{X_i \in \mathcal{B}_0} \|w_1, X_i\| + \sum_{X_i \notin \mathcal{B}_0} \|w_1, X_i\| + \sum_{i=1}^{s} \|w_1, U_i\| \geqslant 3\sum_{j=1}^{s} b_j^0 + (r - 1 - \sum_{j=1}^{s} b_j^0) + s = \Delta + 2\sum_{j=1}^{s} b_j^0 - 1$, or $2\sum_{j=1}^{s} b_j^0 \leqslant 1$. Hence, $b_j^0 = 0$ for all j.

Let $\mathcal{B}_1$ denote $\cup_{j=1}^{s} B_j^1$. For an arbitrary j, (6), (7) and (10) of Lemma 9 imply that

$$\begin{aligned}
2\Delta &= \deg(u_j) + \deg(v_j) \\
&= \textstyle\sum_{X_i \in B_j^1} \|X_i, U_j\| + \sum_{X_i \in \mathcal{B}_1 \setminus B_j^1} \|X_i, U_j\| \\
&\quad + \textstyle\sum_{X_i \notin \mathcal{B}_1} \|X_i, U_j\| + \sum_{j'=1}^{s} \|U_j, U_{j'}\| + \|w_1, U_j\| \\
&\geqslant b_j^1 + 3\textstyle\sum_{\substack{j'=1 \\ j' \neq j}}^{s} b_{j'}^1 + 3 + 2(r - 1 - \sum_{j'=1}^{s} b_{j'}^1) + 2(s - 1) + 1 \\
&= 2\Delta + \textstyle\sum_{\substack{j'=1 \\ j' \neq j}}^{s} b_{j'}^1 - b_j^1,
\end{aligned}$$

equivalently, $\sum_{\substack{j'=1\\ j'\neq j}}^{s} b^1_{j'} \leqslant b^1_j$.

By symmetry, we have either (i) $b^1_j = 0$ for all j, or (ii) $s = 2$ and $b^1_1 = b^1_2 = b > 0$. In either case, for an arbitrary pair of distinct j and j', $\|X_i, U_j\| = 3$ if $X_i \in B^1_{j'}$; $\|X_i, U_j\| = 2$ and $G[X_i \cup U_j \cup U_{j'}] = K_1 \cup 2K_3$ if $X_i \notin \mathcal{B}_1$.

Consider the case $b^1_j = 0$ for all j. By (12) of Lemma 9, $\|X_i, u_1\| = \|X_i, v_1\| = \|u_1, U_j\| = \|v_1, U_j\| = 1$ for all $i > 1$ and $j > 1$. Then $\Delta = \deg(u_1) = \|u_1, w_1 \cup X_1\| + \sum_{i=2}^{r} \|u_1, X_i\| + \sum_{i=1}^{s} \|u_1, U_i\| = \|u_1, w_1 \cup X_1\| + (r-1) + (s-1) = \|u_1, w_1 \cup X_1\| + \Delta - 2$, hence $\|u_1, w_1 \cup X_1\| = 2$. Similarly, $\|v_1, w_1 \cup X_1\| = 2$. These are impossible since $\|u_1, w_1 \cup X_1\| \geqslant 3$ or $\|v_1, w_1 \cup X_1\| \geqslant 3$ by (6) of Lemma 9.

Consider the case $s = 2$ and $b^1_1 = b^1_2 = b > 0$. Assume $j = 1$ or 2. Then $\|X_i, U_j\| = 3$ if $X_i \in B^1_{3-j}$ by (10) of Lemma 9 and $G[w_1 \cup U_1 \cup U_2] = K_2 \cup K_3$ by (13) of Lemma 9. We may let $G[w_1 \cup U_1 \cup U_2] = \{w_1u_1u_2w_1, v_1v_2\}$. Let

$$D_1 = \{X_i \in B^1_1 \mid \|X_i, v_1\| = 1\} \text{ and } |D_1| = d_1;$$

$$D_2 = \{X_i \in B^1_2 \mid \|X_i, v_2\| = 1\} \text{ and } |D_2| = d_2.$$

Note that D_1 and D_2 are disjoint by (10) of Lemma 9. Now suppose that $X_i \in D_j$ with $x_i \sim v_j$. If $w_1 \not\sim y_i$, then G would have more than r 3-independent sets since $w_1 \cup X_i \cup U_j$ can be partitioned into independent sets $\{w_1, v_j, y_i\}$ and $\{u_j, x_i, z_i\}$. Hence, $w_1 \sim y_i$. Similarly, $w_1 \sim z_i$, $u_{3-j} \sim y_i$ and $u_{3-j} \sim z_i$. If $v_{3-j} \not\sim x_i$, then G would have more than r 3-independent sets since $X_i \cup U_1 \cup U_2$ can be partitioned into independent sets $\{u_{3-j}\}$, $\{v_j, y_i, z_i\}$ and $\{u_j, x_i, v_{3-j}\}$. Hence, $v_{3-j} \sim x_i$. Then $\|w_1, X_i\| \geqslant 2$, $\|u_{3-j}, X_i\| = 2$ and $\|v_{3-j}, X_i\| = 1$. By the same argument, if $X_i \in B^1_j \setminus D_j$ with $u_j \sim x_i$, then $u_{3-j} \sim x_i$, $v_{3-j} \sim y_i$ and $v_{3-j} \sim z_i$. Thus $\|u_{3-j}, X_i\| = 1$ and $\|v_{3-j}, X_i\| = 2$.

Since $\Delta \geqslant \deg(w_1) \geqslant 2d_1 + 2d_2 + (r - 1 - d_1 - d_2) + s = \Delta + d_1 + d_2 - 1$, we have $d_1 + d_2 \leqslant 1$.

If $d_1+d_2 = 0$, then $d_1 = d_2 = 0$. It follows that $\Delta = \deg(u_1) \geqslant \|u_1, w_1 \cup X_1\| + (r-1) + (s-1) = \|u_1, w_1 \cup X_1\| + \Delta - 2$ and $\deg(v_1) \geqslant \|v_1, w_1 \cup X_1\| + 2b^1_2 + (r-1-b^1_1-b^1_2) + (s-1) = \|v_1, w_1 \cup X_1\| + \Delta - 2$. Hence $\|u_1, w_1 \cup X_1\| \leqslant 2$ and $\|v_1, w_1 \cup X_1\| \leqslant 2$, contradicting (6) of Lemma 9.

If $d_1 + d_2 = 1$, say $d_1 = 1$ and $d_2 = 0$, then $\Delta = \deg(v_1) = \|v_1, w_1 \cup X_1\| + 1 + 2b^1_2 + (r - 1 - b^1_1 - b^1_2) + (s - 1) = \|v_1, w_1 \cup X_1\| + \Delta - 1$, hence $\|v_1, w_1 \cup X_1\| = 1$. Similarly, $\Delta = \deg(u_2) = \|u_2, w_1 \cup X_1\| + 2 + (b^1_1 - 1) + b^1_2 + (r-1-b^1_1-b^1_2) + (s-1) = \|u_2, w_1 \cup X_1\| + \Delta - 1$, hence $\|u_2, w_1 \cup X_1\| = 1$. Since $G[w_1 \cup U_1 \cup U_2] = \{w_1u_1u_2w_1, v_1v_2\}$, we have $\|v_1, X_1\| = \|v_1, w_1 \cup X_1\| - \|v_1, w_1\| = 1$ and $\|u_2, X_1\| = \|u_2, w_1 \cup X_1\| - \|u_2, w_1\| = 1 - 1 = 0$. Hence,

there exists some vertex $\alpha \in X_1$ such that $\alpha \not\sim v_1$ and $\alpha \not\sim u_2$. Since $w_1 \cup X_1 \cup U_1 \cup U_2$ can be partitioned into independent sets $\{u_1, v_2\}$, $\{v_1, u_2, \alpha\}$ and $w_1 \cup (X_1 \setminus \{\alpha\})$, G has more than r 3-independent sets, a contradiction.

Subcase 3.2. For all i, $\|w_1, X_i\| \geqslant 1$.

By (2) of Lemma 9, $\Delta \geqslant \deg(w_1) \geqslant r + s = \Delta$. Thus $\deg(w_1) = \Delta$ and $\|w_1, X_i\| = \|w_1, U_j\| = 1$ for all i and j. We may let $N(w_1) = \{x_1, \ldots, x_r, u_1, \ldots, u_s\}$. If $v_j \not\sim v_{j'}$ for some pair of distinct j and j', then $\{w_1, v_j, v_{j'}\}$ would be a 3-independent set disjoint from all X_i's, a contradiction. It follows that $\{v_1, \ldots, v_s\}$ forms a K_s.

We shall establish a sequence of claims in order to show that Subcase 3.2 also leads to a contradiction. In the course of proving the claims, we derive one of the following two consequences by negating each of the claims.

(A) A new maximal $[r, s, t]$-coloring of G is obtained such that the unique singleton color class is independent of some color class of size 3, i.e., Subcase 3.1 holds.

(B) More than r 3-independent sets are constructed.

Clearly, both (A) and (B) imply contradictions, and hence the original claims are true.

Claim 1. For all i, i' $(i \neq i')$ and j, $\deg(x_i) = \Delta$ and $\|x_i, X_{i'}\| = \|x_i, U_j\| = 1$.

If $\|x_i, X_{i'}\| = 0$ for some distinct i and i', then (A) occurs since $w_1 \cup X_i \cup X_{i'}$ can be partitioned into independent sets $\{x_i\}$, $X_{i'}$ and $\{w_1, y_i, z_i\}$. Hence, $\|x_i, X_{i'}\| \geqslant 1$ for all distinct i and i'. If $\|x_i, U_j\| = 0$ for some i and j, then (B) occurs since $w_1 \cup X_i \cup U_j$ can be partitioned into 3-independent sets $\{x_i, u_j, v_j\}$ and $\{w_1, y_i, z_i\}$. Hence, $\|x_i, U_j\| \geqslant 1$ for all i and j. Therefore, $\Delta \geqslant \deg(x_i) \geqslant (r-1) + s + 1 = \Delta$ and the claim is true.

Claim 2. For all i, j and j' $(j \neq j')$, $\deg(u_j) = \Delta$ and $\|u_j, X_i\| = \|u_j, U_{j'}\| = 1$.

If $\|u_j, X_i\| = 0$ for some i and j, then (A) occurs since $w_1 \cup X_i \cup U_j$ can be partitioned into independent sets $\{u_j\}$, X_i and $\{w_1, v_j\}$. Hence, $\|u_j, X_i\| \geqslant 1$ for all i and j. By (7) of Lemma 9, $\|u_j, U_{j'}\| \geqslant 1$ for all distinct j and j'. Therefore, $\Delta \geqslant \deg(u_j) \geqslant r + (s-1) + 1 = \Delta$ and the claim is true.

Claim 3. For all i and j, $x_i \sim u_j$.

Suppose on the contrary that $x_p \not\sim u_q$ for some p and q. By Claim 1, $x_p \sim v_q$. By Claim 2, we may assume that $u_q \sim y_p$. We now prove the following four statements.

(3.1) We have $\deg(y_p) = \Delta$, $\|y_p, X_i\| = 1$ for all $i \neq p$ and $y_p \sim v_j$ for all j.

If $\|y_p, X_i\| = 0$ for some $i \neq p$, then (A) occurs since $w_1 \cup X_p \cup X_i \cup U_q$ can be partitioned into independent sets $\{y_p\}$, X_i, $\{u_q, x_p, z_p\}$ and $\{w_1, v_q\}$. Hence, $\|y_p, X_i\| \geqslant 1$ for all $i \neq p$. If $y_p \not\sim v_j$ for some j, then (B) occurs since disjoint 3-independent sets

$\{u_q, x_p, z_p\}$ and $\{w_1, v_j, y_p\}$ are included in $w_1 \cup X_p \cup U_q \cup U_j$. Hence, $y_p \sim v_j$ for all j. Therefore, $\Delta \geqslant \deg(y_p) \geqslant (r-1)+s+1 = \Delta$ and the statement is true.

(3.2) We have $\deg(v_q) = \Delta$ and $\|v_q, X_i\| = 1$ for all $i \neq p$.

If $\|v_q, X_i\| = 0$ for some $i \neq p$, then (A) occurs since $w_1 \cup U_q \cup X_p \cup X_i$ can be partitioned into independent sets $\{v_q\}$, X_i, $\{u_q, x_p, z_p\}$ and $\{w_1, y_p\}$. Hence, $\|v_q, X_i\| \geqslant 1$ for all $i \neq p$. Since v_q is adjacent to x_p, y_p and v_j, $\Delta \geqslant \deg(v_q) \geqslant 2+(r-1)+(s-1) = \Delta$ and the statement is true.

(3.3) For all $j \neq q$, $x_p \sim u_j$.

Suppose $x_p \not\sim u_j$ for some $j \neq q$. By (3.1), $y_p \sim v_j$ and $\|y_p, U_h\| = 1$ for all h, and hence $y_p \not\sim u_j$. By (3.2), $v_q \not\sim z_p$ since it is known that $v_q \sim x_p$. Then (B) occurs since disjoint 3-independent sets $\{x_p, y_p, u_j\}$ and $\{w_1, z_p, v_q\}$ are included in $w_1 \cup X_p \cup U_q \cup U_j$.

(3.4) For all $j \neq q$, $u_q \sim u_j$.

Suppose $u_q \not\sim u_j$ for some $j \neq q$. Since $\{v_1, \ldots, v_s\}$ forms a K_s, it follows from (3.2) that $v_q \not\sim u_j$. Then (B) occurs since $\{u_q, v_q, u_j\}$ is a 3-independent set disjoint from all X_i's.

Statements (3.1) to (3.4) have been established. We may choose any q' different from q. By Claim 1, Claim 2, (3.3) and (3.4), $v_{q'} \not\sim x_p$ and $v_{q'} \not\sim u_q$. Then (B) occurs since disjoint 3-independent sets $\{x_p, u_q, v_{q'}\}$ and $\{w_1, y_p, z_p\}$ are included in $w_1 \cup X_p \cup U_q \cup U_{q'}$. Claim 3 is therefore proved.

Claim 4. For all i and j, $u_i \sim u_j$.

Suppose that $u_i \not\sim u_j$ for some i and j. By Claims 1, 2 and 3, $x_1 \not\sim v_i$ and $\{y_1, z_1, u_i, u_j\}$ is a 4-independent set. Then (A) occurs since $w_1 \cup X_1 \cup U_i \cup U_j$ can be partitioned into independent sets $\{u_i\}$, $\{y_1, z_1, u_j\}$, $\{w_1, v_j\}$ and $\{x_1, v_i\}$.

We have established Claims 1 to 4 and are ready to show that a contradiction can be derived from Subcase 3.2. By Claims 3 and 4, $x_i \not\sim x_{i'}$ for some i and i' since $N(w_1) = \{x_1, \ldots, x_r, u_1, \ldots, u_s\}$ and no component of G is a $K_{\Delta+1}$. Then it follows from Claims 1, 2, 3 and 4 that (B) occurs since disjoint 3-independent sets $\{w_1, y_i, z_i\}$, $\{u_1, y_{i'}, z_{i'}\}$ and $\{v_1, x_i, x_{i'}\}$ are included in $w_1 \cup X_i \cup X_{i'} \cup U_1$.

Now, we have refuted Cases 1, 2 and 3 since each of them led to contradictions. Therefore, G cannot have a maximal $[r, s, t]$-coloring with $r+s+t = \Delta+1$ and the proof is complete. ∎

Acknowledgment. The authors are grateful to Professor Kostochka for directing their attention to a recent manuscript [5] in which he and Kierstead established the following. Let G be a graph with $\chi(G), \Delta(G), |G|/4 \leqslant r$. If r is even or G does not

contain $K_{r,r}$, then G is equitably r-colorable.

References

[1] R. L. Brooks, On colouring the nodes of a network, Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc. 37 (1941), 194–197.

[2] B.-L. Chen, K.-W. Lih and P.-L. Wu, Equitable coloring and the maximum degree, European J. Combin. 15 (1994), 443–447.

[3] A. Hajnal and E. Szemerédi, "Proof of a conjecture of Erdős", Combinatorial Theory and Its Applications, Vol. II, Colloq. Math. Soc. Janos Bolyai 4, P. Erdős, A. Rényi and V. T. Sós, (Editors), North-Holland, Amsterdam (1970), pp. 601–623.

[4] H. A. Kierstead and A. V. Kostochka, Every 4-colorable graph with maximum degree 4 has an equitable 4-coloring, J. Graph Theory 71 (2012), 31–48.

[5] H. A. Kierstead and A. V. Kostochka, A refinement of a result of Corrádi and Hajnal, manuscript (2014).

[6] K.-W. Lih, "Equitable coloring of graphs", Handbook of Combinatorial Optimization, 2nd ed., P. M. Pardalos, D.-Z. Du and R. L. Graham (Editors), Springer, New York, (2013), pp. 1199–1248.

[7] K.-W. Lih and P.-L. Wu, On equitable coloring of bipartite graphs, Discrete Math. 151 (1996), 155–160.

[8] W. Meyer, Equitable coloring, Amer. Math. Monthly, 80 (1973), 920–922.